DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 857 FL 024 417

AUTHOR Tamada, Yutaka
TITLE The Review of Studies in Related to Language Learning Strategies.
PUB DATE 97
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052))

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classification; Classroom Techniques; Comparative Analysis; Definitions; Foreign Countries; *Language Research; *Learning Strategies; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Second Languages; *Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

A discussion of second language learning strategies (LLS) first reviews research on defining, classifying, and listing LLS, then looks at studies on factors affecting learners' LLS choices, and finally examines their application in second language teaching. A definition of LLS as "specific action taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" is selected as the clearest. A classification system (strategy inventory) by the same researcher is also selected as the most comprehensive, with some problems remaining to be resolved. Eight factors affecting learners' LLS choices, identified in previous research, are discussed briefly: sex; motivation; career orientation or motivation; personality; teaching methods; cultural background and experience abroad; age; and classroom tasks given to learners. Areas in which further research is needed on these factors and on how research on LLS can be used in the language classroom are noted. Forms used in identifying learners' LLS are appended. Contains 29 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Yutaka Tamada
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

FL

ED 404 857

The review of studies in related to language learning strategies.

Yutaka TAMADA
Nagoya international school of business

Introduction

Before the 1960s, in the field of second language learning and teaching, many researchers had focused on teaching methods or strategies for a long time. At that time, there were mainly interested in the following question; "Which methods are more effective to learn a second language?" From the 1960s, however, researchers have recognised that it was insufficient to explain language education without concerning learners, because when teachers taught learners a second language, they found that there was a difference in the learners' language proficiency. Since then, researchers' interests have shifted from the study of teaching method to the study of learners' characteristics and their effects on second language acquisition. Gardner and Lambert's (1972) longitudinal research pointed out that learners' attitude and motivations were important factors in second language acquisition. Researchers, then, have been interested in what good language learners did while they were learning. It is called "a good language learner (GLL) studies, and this type of study has developed into the study of language learning strategies (LLS).

Since the 1970s, many researchers have carried out their researches on LLS. Although there are some overlaps between them, it is possible to divide them into three main interests; 1) a good language learner studies (GLL studies), 2) studies on defining, classifying, and listing LLS, and 3) studies about various factors that affect learners' LLS choices.

Of these three interests, GLL was first researched, in the late 1970s. This type of study focused only on what a good language learner did and which LLS they chose in his/her language learning. These studies showed that this factor, a good language learner, affected learners' LLS choices. Judging from this result, it is possible to think that this type of study is the same as the third interest; 3) studies about various factors that affect learners' LLS choices.

In this article, first, I will review some significant research about defining, classifying, and listing LLS. Second, I will review studies about various factors that affect learners' LLS choices, including some GLL studies. Finally, I will introduce application for a second or foreign language teaching.

Studies about defining, classifying, and listing LLS

1. The definition of LLS

In LLS studies, the definition of LLS is the most basic and important issue. Although LLS have been defined by several researchers (Bialystok 1978, Rubin 1987, Chamot 1987, O'Malley and Chamot 1990, and Oxford 1990), there had been no clear definition before Chamot's (1987) research. In Table 1, I list five definitions of LLS. As seen from Table 1, it is possible to divide their definitions into two factors; the elements that LLS include, and the purpose that learners use LLS for.

As to the elements of LLS, for example, Bialystok (1978), defined it as "optional means" (p.71), and Rubin (1987) as "strategies which contribute to the development of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the language system which the learner constructs and affects learning directly." (p.23) Judging from these definitions, it is possible to say that Bialystok's (1978) definition tells us unclearly about what is "optional means", and as a result, it seems vague what are the elements of LLS. On the other hand, it seems to me that Rubin (1987) described it more in detail than Bialystok, and Rubin classified the strategies affecting learning indirectly into other strategies, what is called "social strategies" (Rubin 1987, p. 27). Hence, it is clear that there is no agreement between both researchers about the elements of LLS.

As to the purpose that learners use LLS for, Bialystok (1978) defined the purpose as "to improve competence in a second language." (p.71) In other words, learners learn LLS only to be more proficient learners, not to learn effectively or learn easily. However, Rubin's (1987) definition did not explain the purpose that learners use LLS for. Hence,

RESEARCHERS	DEFINITION
Bialystok, E. (1978)	language learning strategies which are defined as optional means for exploiting available information to improve competence in a second language. (p. 71)
Rubin, J. (1987)	learning strategies are strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affects learning directly. (p. 23)
Chamot, A. (1987)	learning strategies are techniques, approaches, or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning and recall of both linguistic and content area information. (p. 71)
O'Malley, J., and Chamot, A. (1990)	the special thoughts or behaviours that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information. (p. 1)
Oxford, R. (1990)	learning strategies are specific action taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations. (p. 8)

Table 1 Definition of LLS

there are also no agreement about the purpose of learners' LLS use between Bialystok and Rubin.

However, since Chamot's (1987) study, the definition has been changed. All three researchers (groups), Chamot (1987), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), and Oxford (1990), defined both factors in more detail than the previous studies. Moreover, their definitions have become similar.

For example, as to the elements of LLS, Chamot (1987) defined it as "techniques, or approaches, or deliberate actions," (p.71) O'Malley and Chamot (1990) treated it as "special thoughts or behaviours," (p. 1) and Oxford (1990) thought of it as "specific actions." (p.8) According to Chamot (1987), and O'Malley and Chamot (1990), it is unclear about whether the elements of LLS are learner's thoughts, behaviours, or both.

However, it is understandable that Oxford thought that LLS included both thoughts and behaviours even though she defined LLS only as "action." (Oxford, 1990, p. 8) According to Oxford's list of LLS (1990, pp. 18-21) (see Note 2), she listed "setting goals and objectives" (p. 20) (e.g., to be a fluent speaker of second language to get a good result next examination etc.), and "identifying the purpose of a language task" strategy (p. 20) (e.g., the purpose of this task is to communicate with peers actively, the purpose of this task is to use the present perfect form as much as possible etc.) Both strategies showed above are about learner's mental attitude for second language learning. Hence, it is possible to say that these strategies explain learner's thought in his/her second language learning. She also listed and "repeating" strategy (p. 19) and "taking notes" strategy (p. 19). It is possible to think that these strategies explain learner's action in his/her second language learning. Hence, it is reasonable that Oxford thought that LLS included both learner's thoughts and behaviours.

As to the latter factor, none of them mentioned the purpose of using LLS for learners as being "proficient learners", but as being able to "facilitate the learning," (Chamot 1987,p.71) "help them comprehend," (O'Malley and Chamot 1990, p. 1) and "make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable." (Oxford 1990, p. 8) It seems to me that, since Chamot's (1987) study, learner's purpose of LLS use has changed from becoming good or successful learners who speak a second language fluently, to becoming intelligent learners who know very well about how to learn a second language more successfully. In particular, Oxford describes the purpose of learner's LLS use more in detail than any other researchers.

Consequently, as far as I reviewed the definition of LLS, Oxford's (1990) definition is clearer than those of any other researchers. Even though her definition about the elements of LLS needs more explanation (e.g., about the element of LLS), it is clear that her definition about the elements of LLS are learner's thoughts and behaviours, and the purpose of learner's LLS use is much more clearer than any other researchers.

2. Classification and list of LLS

Since the late 1970s, several researchers have attempted to classify and list language learning strategies (LLS), and it is possible to divide their classifications into two categories; whether LLS include all kinds of strategies, or not.

In the earlier studies on LLS, there were some strategies other than LLS that were relevant to second language learning. For example, Tarone (1980, p. 419) proposes two kinds of strategies such as "Strategy of Language use" and "Language Learning Strategy". In "Strategy of Language use", she introduces "Communication strategy" and "Production strategy" as follows;

Communication strategy	-a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared. ·e.g. paraphrase, transfer, avoidance.
Production strategy	-an attempt to use one's linguistic system efficiently and clearly, with a minimum of effort. e.g. simplification, rehearsal, discourse planning. (p. 419)

She also introduces "Language learning strategy" as follows;

> Language learning strategy - an attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language.
> e.g. memorisation, repetition, etc. (p. 419)

In her description, she points out the difference between "communication strategies" and "production strategies." When learners use "communication strategies", they choose strategies such as the strategy of avoidance to communicate and the strategy of looking for alternative means to communicate with other people. In other words, when a speaker uses the strategy of avoidance to communicate, he/she does not attempt to communicate a certain meaning if a listener does not understand, and when a speaker uses the strategy of looking for alternate means, he/she attempts to look for other words or phrases to make a listener understand what the speaker wants to communicate in negotiation of meaning. On the other hand, when learners use "production strategies", they do not choose the strategy of looking for alternate means to communicate with other people, but choose avoidance strategy. That is to say, when a speaker uses the avoidance strategy, he/she plans or rehearses what he/she wants to communicate so that a listener can understand without negotiation of meaning.

Moreover, she also points out the distinction between "strategy of language use" (communication strategies and production strategies) and "language learning strategies." According to Tarone's (1980) explanation about both strategies, the difference between them is whether learners use any strategy for the purpose of communication with other people, and whether learners use any strategy for the purpose of developing linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language. She indicates, then, that "strategies of language use, (communication strategies and production strategies) are used when learners primarily do not have the purpose of learning, but have the purpose of communicating, and "language learning strategies" are used when learners primarily do not have the purpose of communication, but have the purpose of learning.

Although her distinction between strategies is understandable as an idea for classifying, it is difficult to distinguish them in real life. For example, it is very difficult to say that a learner does not have any learning purpose when he/she uses communication strategies. .In other words, he/she may have both learning and communication purposes when he/she uses language, because using language is, of course, good for improving his/her language competence. For example, when a speaker is talking with his/her friend and the speaker does not understand what his/her friend said, the speaker sometimes attempts to infer what his/her friend said. In this case, the speaker, of course, has the purpose of communication, but "inferencing" that the speaker did to understand what his/her friend said, is classified into language learning strategies according to Tarone's definition (1980). Hence, in this case, the speaker has not only the purpose of communication, but also the purpose of learning either consciously or subconsciously.

Moreover, to distinguish "communication strategies" from "production strategies" is very difficult. Tarone (1980) suggests that the key difference between them is that production strategies are not used for the primarily purpose of negotiating meaning, but communication strategies are used for that purpose. Although it is possible to say that the difference theoretically, problem is how a researcher judges whether a speaker has the purpose of negotiating meaning or not. Tarone (1980) does not explain about it.

Therefore, Tarone's classification is well explained and divided, depending on a learner's purpose to use strategies, but in her definition of strategies, she does not explain the case that a learner has more than one purpose (e.g. communication and learning purposes) for using strategies either consciously or unconsciously, and even though the learner has one purpose for using strategies, it is not clear how a researcher recognizes the purpose when the learner uses strategies for in their second language learning.

In the 1980s, a new way of classification was introduced by O'Malley and Chamot (O'Malley et al. 1985a,b, O'Malley and Chamot 1990). They introduced Anderson's (1983) cognitive theory that was about how a learner processed new information. They classified strategies according to the level or type of information processing such as "metacognitive strategies," "cognitive strategies," and "social/affective strategies." According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990), the three strategies are defined as follows;

a) Metacognitive strategies are higher order executive skills that may entail planning for, monitoring, or evaluating the success of a learning activity. (Brown et al. 1983 cited in p.44)
b) Cognitive strategies operate directly on incoming information, manipulating it in ways that enhance learning. (p.44)
c) Social/affective strategies represent a broad grouping that involves either interaction with another person or ideational control over affect. (p.45)

In these strategies, O'Malley et al. (1985a, pp. 33-34) list twenty-six kinds of strategies; nine for metacognitive, sixteen for cognitive, and one for social/affective (see Note 1).

In O'Malley and Chamot's classification, there are two important points. First, they treated the learning strategies as the most basic and general ones, and amended Tarone's classification in that learning strategies included all strategies (e.g. metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective). By doing so, it seems to me that problems that Tarone's (1980) classification had are resolved. In other words, each strategy has its own way of information processing, and as a result, it seems to be more clear-cut than Tarone's (1980) classification.

Second, according to O'Malley and Chamot's classification, it seems to be clear that, to some extent, all learners have purpose for second language learning even though they use communication strategies. For example, when a learner uses communication strategies (according to Tarone's definition, communication strategies do not require learning purpose), once the learner finds that he/she can learn some useful expressions or ways of speech through communication, the learner will expect next time to learn something useful through communication with native speaker of target language. This experience can make learners have learning purpose either consciously or unconsciously when they use communication strategies. Tarone's (1980) classification can not explain such case. Hence, it seems to me that O'Malley and Chamot's classification is more realistic than Tarone's one.

Since the late 1980s, Oxford has developed O'Malley et al.'s (1985a) classification in greater detail. At first, she (1990) classifies two strategies in learning strategies; "direct strategies" (1990, p. 14) that affect learners' second language learning directly, and "indirect strategies" (1990, p. 14) that affect learners' second language learning indirectly. She also assesses O'Malley et al.'s (1985a) strategy list and reclassifies them into the following six categories; "memory," "cognitive," "compensation,"

"metacognitive," "affective," and "social" strategies, and then, defines sixty-two (see Note 2) strategies under these six categories. In her strategy list, she explains more clearly and in greater detail than any other researchers. Hence, it is possible to say that her strategy list includes almost what learners think or do to learn a second language more than any other researchers' classification.

However, even in Oxford's classifications, list of strategies, and her SILL (see Note 3), there are some problems.

As to the classifications and list of LLS, first, as she admits herself (1990, p. 16), "current understanding of language strategies is necessarily in its infancy ... only a proposal to be tested through practical classroom use and through research." In other words, her classification of learning strategies is not perfect, and needs further research.

Second, it seems to me that there is some difficulty in distinguishing all sixty-two strategies from each other. For example, it seems to me that the "memory strategies" must be classified as "practising strategies". It is because all "practising strategies" can be used for memorising. In other words, as Anderson (1983) states, all knowledge or skills are acquired through three stages; "cognitive," "associative," and "autonomous." In the "cognitive stage", learners memorise new information, especially through practising. Hence, it seems impossible to classify "memory strategies" as different from "practising strategies".

As to her SILL, she thought that her LLS list was available for either EFL or ESL learners and made a questionnaire about learners' LLS use. That questionnaire became to be a SILL. She prepared, then, two kinds of SILL; one was for English speakers learning a new language (version 5.1), the other was for speakers of other languages learning English. (version 7.0) However, she did not distinguish the EFL learners from ESL learner. That is to say, she thought her SILL was appropriate for either EFL or ESL learners.

Recently, however, some researchers has argued the validity of her SILL. (LoCastro, 1994, 1995; Oxford and Green, 1995) Further, it seems to me that her SILL has three problems to carry out the research to Japanese learners.

First, according to the version 7.0 of her SILL, it is impossible to collect information about all of her sixty-two LLS. This is because there are only fifty statements in this questionnaire, in addition, there are some statements that include more than one strategy, or some statements that include the same strategy. For example, statement No.14 in her SILL version 7.0 "I start conversations in English" can represent the strategy of "practicing naturally" in her sixty-two LLS, and No.15 "I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English" can also represent the same strategy as the statement No.14. On the other hand, No. 24 in her SILL version 7.0 "To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guess" can include both the strategies "guessing using linguistic clues" and "guessing using other clues" in her sixty-two LLS. Hence, it is necessary to add extra statements to get all of sixty-two LLS.

Second, even in this version (7.0), it is difficult for learners to understand the statement clearly, because normally learners are not conscious about their learning strategies. As a result, learners sometimes do not know clearly what they do in their learning.

Third, in this version (7.0), the choice of response is rather vague, because it is difficult for learners to measure the degree of truth.

These problems need to be solved before the research or in a pilot questionnaire.

In the discussion above, I have looked at three kinds of classifications: those of Tarone (1980), Chamot and O'Malley (1990), and Oxford (1990). As a result of considering their strength and weakness, it seems that Oxford's (1990) classification is more comprehensive than those of other two researchers. It is, of course, neither a perfect nor stable classification and is open for adding other categories or strategies. Moreover, there are some problems of interpretation with her sixty-two LLS. However, it seems to me that her classification is more comprehensive and covers learners' thoughts and behaviours better than the any other researchers.

Various factors affecting learner's LLS choice

As I discussed in the previous section, Oxford's (1990) classification of language learning strategies (LLS) is very comprehensive. However, learners do not always use all LLS, but only use a part of them. Many researchers have studied several factors that affect learners' LLS choices. The following ten factors have been studied by these researchers and these factors will be discussed in turn.

1) Sex
2) Motivation
3) Career orientation
4) Personality
5) Teaching methods
6) Cultural background and studying abroad
7) Age
8) Tasks

1. Sex

Not so many researches about the relationship between sex and LLS choice has been carried out. However, some researchers have pointed out the significant relationship between them even in such limited studies. For example, Politzer (1983) studied learning strategies of 90 university students in the United States, and found that female students used social strategies significantly more than male students. Oxford and Nyikos (1989), and Ehrman and Oxford (1989) investigated university students and found that female students used strategies more often than male students.

Judging from these studies, although it is not clear which strategy is employed by females, it is reported that female students, in general, employ a wider range of LLS than male students.

2. Motivation

Before researchers began to investigate the relationship between motivation and LLS choice, Gardner and Lambert (1972) carried out a longitudinal research on the relationship between motivation and second language acquisition.

They suggested (1972, p. 3) that there were two types of motivations such as "instrumental" and "integrative" motivations as follows;

instrumental motivation - the purpose of language study reflects the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement, such as getting ahead in

one's occupation

integrative motivation - if the student wishes to learn more about the other cultural community because he is interested in it in an open-minded way, to the point of eventually being accepted as a member of that other group.

As a result of their longitudinal research, they found that learners' motivation had a good effect on second language learning.

In the 1980s, researchers began to study the relationship between motivation and LLS choice. For example, Oxford and Nyikos (1989) reported the relationship between them as follows;

> the degree of expressed motivation to learn the language was the most powerful influence on strategy choice....The more motivated students used learning strategies of all these kinds more often than did the less motivated students. (p. 294)

However, it is not clear which motivation (integrative, or instrumental motivation) affects LLS choice more significantly or how motivation affects LLS choice. Further research will be required.

3. Career orientation

What learners do for a job, and what they major at university in, are also relevant to the motivation process. According to Gardner and Lambert (1972), this kind of motivation is called an "instrumental motivation".

Politzer and McGroarty (1985) studied the relationship between the field of specialisation and LLS choice in the United States. They found that the students who wanted to study engineering/science reported using fewer LLS that were viewed as positive as opposed to the students who wanted to study social science/humanities. However, it should be borne in mind that the majority of engineering/science students were Asian students, and all of the social science/humanities students were Hispanic students. Hence, there is a possibility that this study confuses difference in the field of specialisation with the difference in students' nationalities.

Oxford and Nyikos (1989) also did a similar study. They investigated university students and divided them into three major groups; 1) technical (engineering, computer science, and physical science); 50%, 2) social science, education, and humanities; 35%, and 3) business and other; 15%. As a result of their study, there was significant difference between the three major groups in their LLS choices; the second group (social science, education, and humanities students) reported using LLS more than other groups. Ehrman and Oxford (1989) investigate the difference in LLS choice among students, instructors (native speakers of foreign language), and professional language teachers. They found that professional language teachers reported greater use of LLS than students and instructors.

Judging from this research, it is clear that the field of specialisation and career choice can affect learners' LLS choices very much. In other words, if a student chooses social science, education, and humanities as a major, or professional language teaching as a career, he/she will use a wider range of LLS than other groups.

4. Personality

As to the relationship between personality and LLS choice, Ehrman and Oxford's (1989) study is quite comprehensive. They use the measure of MBTI (Myers-Brigg Type Indicator) and divide students into eight personality types; 1) extraversion, 2) introversion, 3) sensing, 4) intuition, 5) thinking, 6) feeling, 7) judging, and 8) perceiving. They found, then, that eight personality types affected students' LLS choices significantly. However, it is questionable whether all students can be divided into only eight categories. It is necessary to further explain this categorisation of personality.

5. Teaching methods

It is easy to imagine that the teaching method can affect learners' LLS choices. For example, it seems to me that the grammar-translation method helps learners to use "memory or practice strategies" (Oxford 1990, pp. 18-21), and communicative instructional methods help them to use "social strategies" (Oxford 1990, pp. 18-21). Politzer (1983) points out as a conclusion that the students' LLS choices changed according to the teaching method. Ehrman and Oxford (1989) also found that adult students who were learning a foreign language for professional reasons used communication-oriented strategies when their teachers used communicative teaching methods.

6. Cultural background and studying abroad

Only a small amount of research has been carried out regarding the relationship between cultural background and LLS choice. For example, Politzer and McGroarty (1985) reported as a conclusion of their study as follows;

> ...cultural background...has a great deal to do with the type of language learning behavior likely to be used by students. (p.119)

O'Malley et al. (1985b) also pointed out the difference between Hispanic and Asian students in their strategy training in their study.

With regard to the difference in the foreign language learning situation issue, Opper et al. (1990) have carried out very comprehensive research. They investigate both study abroad programs in Europe and in the United States, and the participants as well. As a result of their study, they indicate several areas of impact on participants such as academic effects, effects on foreign language proficiency, cultural impact, change in students' competence, attitudes and views. Watanabe (1990) investigated the relationship between Japanese college/university students' external factors such as entrance examination, year spent at college/university, and staying abroad, and their LLS choices. As a result of his study, he concluded that "staying overseas affected the use of the communication learning strategies" (p. 45)

Judging from these studies, it seems to me that studying abroad, including staying abroad, can be an important factor affecting learners' LLS choices as well as cultural background.

7. Age

Although not many researches have been carried out, age can affect the learners' LLS choices. Bialystok (1981) identified three LLS (practising, monitoring, and inferencing) and studied the relationship between learners' LLS choices and their age (Grade). As a result of her study, she found that older students (16-17 years old, Grade 12) employed the three LLS more frequently than younger students (14-15 years old, Grade 10), and that there was a greater effect of these LLS found in Grade 12 students than in Grade 10 students.

More recently, Oxford and Nyikos (1989) have studied the relationship between university students' variables and their choices of LLS. They found that there was a significant relationship between the year of study and the choice of LLS. In other words, the longer years learners study foreign language, the more they choose functional practice strategies and conversational strategies.

However, it is unclear that these results are emerged from either age or years of study. Further research will be required about the relationship between age and learners' LLS choices.

8. Tasks

Tasks given to learners in the class can influence learners' LLS choices as well as the teaching method. Bialystok (1981) investigated the relationship between kinds of task and learners' LLS choices. She found that learners used LLS according to the task requirement; for example, "monitoring strategy was the most beneficial for tasks requiring attention to form" (Bialystok, 1981, p. 34).

To sum up of this section, it has been shown that there are eight kinds of factors affecting learners' LLS choices. However, some factors need further research.

For example, in the research about the relationship between age and learners' LLS choices, it is not apparent whether the age is thought the same as the years of study. Secondly, in the research about the relationship between personality and LLS use, it is not certain whether the category of personality is applicable for all of the learners.

Nevertheless, as the results of many researches have shown, these affective factors are very important for learners' LLS choices. Therefore, when other researchers study the LLS, they should bear these affective factors in mind.

Application for second or foreign language teaching

This LLS study is not a study for itself, but it should be applied to second or foreign language teaching. Several researchers of course, have already studied the relationship between LLS and second or foreign language learning. For example, Bialystok (1983b) investigated the relationship between strategy training and vocabulary acquisition, but failed to find a clear relationship between them. Cohen and Aphek (1980) carried out their study about the relationship between learners' use of association strategies and vocabulary learning and they found that association strategies helped advanced learners to learn vocabulary. O'Malley et al. (1985b) studied whether strategy training could improve learners' speaking and listening skills and found clear improvement of speaking skill through strategy training, but failed to find any significant improvement of listening skill. However, it is still not clear how teachers should teach or train students to use LLS for their successful language learning. Hence, it is necessary to investigate this area as well.

Conclusion

This article reviewed the following three aspects about LLS study; 1) defining, classifying, and listing LLS, 2) various factors affecting learners' LLS choices, and 3) application for second or foreign language teaching. Although each aspect had been studied various researchers since the 1970s, there is still vague area in it. For example, as to the first aspect, it is possible to say that Oxford's (1990) definition, classification, and list of LLS as well as her Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) are more comprehensive than any other researchers' ones. However, as I mentioned in the previous section, there are still problems to be solved. Further study has to be required.

As to the second aspect, although many researchers have studied affective factors in language learning, it is not clear whether two out of eight factors (i.e. age, and personality) affect learners' LLS choices. For further study, these factors should be defined more clearly and examined by other researchers.

As to the last aspect, it seems that there are no framework about how teacher should train/teach students LLS. Moreover, there are no agreement between researchers on LLS training/teaching because of lack of researches on it. Hence, this aspect should be discussed and examined more by other researchers.

NOTES

1

Metacognitive strategies (9) - advance organizers, directed attention, selective attention, self-management, advance preparation, self-monitoring, delayed production, self-evaluation, self-reinforcement,

Cognitive strategies (16) - repetition, resourcing, directed physical response, translation, grouping, note-taking, deduction, recombination, imagery, auditory representation, keyword, contextualization, elaboration, transfer, inferencing, question for clarification.

Social/affective strategies (1) - cooperation.

2

(1) Direct strategies

1. Memory strategies

A. Creating mental linkages - 1) grouping, 2) association/elaborating, 3) placing new words into a context.

B. Applying images and sounds - 4) using imagery 5) semantic mapping, 6) using keywords 7) representing sounds in memory.

C. Reviewing well - 8) structured reviewing

D. Employing action - 9) using physical response or sensation, 10) using mechanical techniques

2. Cognitive strategies

A. Practicing - 11) repeating, 12) formally practicing with sounds and writing systems 13) recognizing and using formulas and patterns, 14) recombining 15) practicing naturally.

B. Receiving and sending messages - 16) getting the idea quickly, 17) using resources for receiving and sending messages.

C. Analyzing and reasoning - 18) reasoning deductively, 19) analyzing expressions 20) analyzing contrastively (across languages) 21) translating, 22) transferring

D. Creating structure for input and output - 23) taking notes, 24) summarizing, 25) highlighting.

3. Compensation strategies.

A. Guessing intelligently - 26) using linguistic clues, 27) using other clues

B. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing.

28) switching to the mother tongue, 29) getting help, 30) using mime or gesture 31) avoiding communication partially or totally, 32) selecting the topic 33) adjusting or approximating the message, 34) coining words, 35) using a circumlocution or synonym.

(2) Indirect strategies

1. Metacognitive strategies.

A. Centering your learning - 36) overviewing and linking with already

known material 37) paying attention, 38) delaying speech production to focus on listening.

B. Arranging and planning your learning - 39) finding out about language learning 40) organizing, 41) setting goals and objectives 42) identifying the purpose of a language task 43) planning for a language task, 44) seeking practice opportunities.

C. Evaluating your learning - 45) self-monitoring, 46) self-evaluating.

2. Affective strategies.

A. Lowering your anxiety - 47) using progressive relaxation, deep breathing, or meditation, 48) using music, 49) using laughter

B. Encouraging yourself - 50) making positive statements, 51) taking risks wisely 52) rewarding yourself

C. Taking your emotional temperature - 53) listening to your body, 54) using checklists 55) writing a language learning diary 56) discussing your feelings with someone else.

3. Social strategies.

A. Asking questions - 57) asking for clarification or verification, 58) asking for correction

B. Cooperating with others - 59) Cooperating with peers, 60) Cooperating with proficient uses of the new language.

C. Empathizing with others - 61) developing cultural understanding 62) becoming aware of others' thoughts and feelings.

3

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Version for Speakers of Other Language Learning English

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)
Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)
(c) R. Oxford, 1989

Directions

This form of the STRATEGY INVENTORY FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING (SILL) is for students of English as a second or foreign language. You will find statements about learning English. Please read each statement. On the separate Worksheet, write the response (1,2,3,4,or 5) that tell HOW TRUE OF YOU THE STATEMENT IS.

1. Never or almost never true of me

2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE OF ME means that the statement is very rarely true of you.

USUALLY NOT TRUE OF ME means that the statements is true less than half the time.

SOMEWHAT TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you about half the time.

USUALLY TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true more than half the time.

ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE OF ME means that the statement is true of you almost always.

Answer in terms of how well the statement describes you. Do not answer how you think you should be, or what other people do. There are not right or wrong answers to these statements. Put your answers on the separate Worksheet. Please make no marks on the items. Work as quickly as you can without being careless. This usually takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, let the teacher know immediately.
(Version 7.0 [ESL/EFL] (c) R. L. Oxford, 1989)

EXAMPLE

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

Read the item, and choose a response (1 through 5 as above), and write it in the space after the item.

I actively seek out opportunities to talk with native speakers of English.

_____

You have just completed the example item. Answer the rest of the items on the Worksheet.

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning
Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)
(c) R. Oxford, 1989

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

(Write answers on Worksheet)

Part A

1. I think of relationship between what I already know and new things I learn in English.

2. I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.

3. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image or picture of the word to help me remember the word.

4. I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.

5. I use rhymes to remember new English words.

6. I use flashcards to remember new English words.

7. I physically act out new English words.

8. I review English lessons often.

9. I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.

Part B

10. I say or write new English words several times.

11. I try to talk like native English speakers.

12. I practice the sounds of English.

13. I use the English words I know in different ways.

14. I start conversations in English.

15. I watch English language TV shows spoken in English or go to movies spoken in English.

16. I read for pleasure in English.

17. I write note, messages, letters, or reports in English.

18. I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully.

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

19. I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.

20. I try to find patterns in English.

21. I find the meaning of an English word by dividing it into parts that I understand.

22. I try not to translate word-for-word.

23. I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.

Part C

24. To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guess.

25. When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gestures.

26. I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.

27. I read English without looking up every new word.

28. I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.

29. If I can't think of an English word, I use word or phrase that means the same thing.

Part D

30. I try to find as many ways as I can to use my English.

31. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.

32. I pay attention when someone is speaking English.

33. I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.

34. I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.

35. I look for people I can talk to in English.

36. I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.

37. I have clear goals for improving my English skills.

38. I think about my progress in learning English.

Part E

39. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.

40. I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.

41. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.

42. I notice if an tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.

43. I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.

44. I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.

Part F

1. Never or almost never true of me
2. Usually not true of me
3. Somewhat true of me
4. Usually true of me
5. Always or almost always true of me

45. If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.

46. I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.

47. I practice English with other students.

48. I ask for help from English speakers.

49. I ask questions in English.

50. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

Your Name _____ Date_____

SILL Worksheet

Version 7.0 (ESL/EFL)

(c) R. Oxford, 1989

1. The blanks (_____) are numbered for each item on the SILL.

2. Write your response to each item (that is, write 1,2,3,4, or 5) in each of the blanks.

Part A	Part B	Part C	Part D	Part E	Part F
1._____	10._____	24._____	30._____	39._____	45._____
2._____	11._____	25._____	31._____	40._____	46._____
3._____	12._____	26._____	32._____	41._____	47._____
4._____	13._____	27._____	33._____	42._____	48._____
5._____	14._____	28._____	34._____	43._____	49._____
6._____	15._____	29._____	35._____	44._____	50._____
7._____	16._____		36._____		
8._____	17._____		37._____		
9._____	18._____		38._____		
	19._____				
	20._____				
	21._____				
	22._____				
	23._____				

REFERENCES

Anderson, J.R. (1983). The architecture of cognition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bialystok, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. Language Learning, 28, 69-83.

Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. Modern Language Journal, 65, 24-35.

Bialystok, E. (1983). Inferencing: Testing the "hypothesis-testing" hypothesis. In H.W. Seliger and M.H. Long (Eds.), Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition (pp. 104-124). Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury house.

Chamot, A. (1987). The learning strategies of ESL students'. In A. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategy in language learning (pp. 71-83). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Cohen, A., and Aphek, E. (1980). Retrospection of second-language, vocabulary over time: investigating the role of mnemonic associations. *System*, 8, 221-235.

Ehrman, M., and Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. Modern English Journal, 73, 291-300.

Ellis, R. (1994). The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fillmore, L.W. (1979). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In C.D.Fillmore, P.Kempler, and W. Wang (Eds.), Individual differences in language ability and language behavior (pp. 203-228). New York: Academic Press.

Fillmore, C., Kempler, D., and Wang, W. (Eds.) (1979). Individual differences in learning ability and language behavior, New York, Academic Press.

Gardner, R.C., and Lambert, W.E. (1972). Attitude and motivation in second language learning. Massachusetts: Newburry House.

LoCastro, V. (1994). Learner strategies and learning environments. TESOL Quarterly, 28, 409-414.

LoCastro, V. (1995). The author responds....TESOL Quarterly, 29, 172-174.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H., and Todesco, A. (1978). The Good Language Learner. Research in Education Series, 7. Tronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

O'Malley, J., and Chamot, A. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., Stewner-Manzanaraes, G., Kupper, L., and Russo, R. (1985a). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. Language Learning, 35 (1), 21-46.

O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., Stewner-Manzanaraes, G., Russo, R., and Kupper, L. (1985b). Learning strategy applications with students of English as second language. TESOL Quarterly, 19 (3), 557-584.

Opper, S., Teichler, U., and Carlson, J. (1990). Impacts of study abroad programmes on students and graduates. Higher Education Policy Series 11, vol. 11. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Oxford, R. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. London: Newburry House.

Oxford, R., and Green, J. (1995). Comments on Virginia LoCastro's "Learning strategies and learning environments": Making sense of learning strategies assessment: Toward a higher standard of research accuracy. TESOL Quarterly, 29, 166-171.

Politzer, R. (1983). An exploratory study of self reported language learning behaviors and their relation to achievement. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6, 54-67.

Politzer, R., and McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviors and their relationship to gain in linguistic and communicate competence. TESOL Quarterly, 19 (1), 103-123.

Rubin, J. (1981). Study of cognitive process in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 2, 117-131.

Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In A. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategies in language learning (pp. 15-30). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Seliger, H.W., and Long, M.H. (1983). Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition. Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury house.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. Language Learning, 30 (2), 417-431.

Watanabe, Y. (1990). External variables affecting language learning strategies of Japanese EFL learners: Effects of entrance examination, years spent at college/university and staying overseas. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation: Lancaster University.

Wenden, A. (1987). How to be a successful language learner: Insights and prescriptions from L2 learners. In A. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategies in language learning (pp. 103-115). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Wenden, A., and Rubin, J. (Eds.) (1987). Learner strategies in language learning. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.